



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,417	09/15/2003	Rebecca Anne Baril		7878
7590	06/07/2006		EXAMINER	
DR. REBECCA A. BARIL, D.P.M. # 701-B 1455 N. CLARK STREET CHICAGO, IL 60610			BOGART, MICHAEL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/661,417	BARIL, REBECCA ANNE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael G. Bogart	3761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: --Lotion Applicator with Hinged Mirror--.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-4 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 2 depends from claim 3 and claim 3 depends from claim 2. This is improper. A dependent claim can not simultaneously be the parent claim to the claim from which it depends MPEP § 608(n).

Claims 1-4 each include multiple sentences. While there is no set statutory form for claims, the present Office practice is to insist that each claim must be the object of a sentence starting with "I (or we) claim," "The invention claimed is" (or the equivalent). Each claim begins with a capital letter and ends with a period. Periods may not be used elsewhere in the claims except for abbreviations. See *Fressola v. Manbeck*, 36 USPQ2d 1211 (D.D.C. 1995). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation, 37 CFR § 1.75(i). MPEP 608.01(m). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "The medical foot helper for diabetic, arthritic, disabled, elderly and obese persons" in lines 13 and 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "The medical foot helper for diabetic, arthritic, disabled, elderly and obese persons" in lines 3 and 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay (US 6,092,254 A) in view of Kline (US 2004/0043352 A1) and Black (US 6,546,588 B1).

Kay teaches an elongated lotion applicator (12) that incorporates an absorbent foam sponge (26) at the applicator tip and a hinged mirror (32, 46) at an opposite end of the applicator that enables a user to visually see where the lotion is being applied (col. 3, lines 4-6)(see figs. 1 and 3, below).




FIG. 1






FIG. 3

Kay does not teach that the mirror is magnified or that the body is rod-shaped and includes a handle made from soft rubber-like material.

Kline teaches a magnified dental mirror that enables a care-giver/dentist to see a magnified image of a patient surgical or dental site (abstract)(see fig. 1B, below).



Black teaches a body cleansing brush (10) with a rod-shaped body and rubber handle (30)(see fig. 1, below). This construction is simple, sturdy and provides a comfortable grip (col. 2, line 49-61).



At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the magnified mirror of Kline and the handle structure of Black with the lotion applicator of Kay in order to provide for a magnified view of the body area where lotion is to be applied and to provide a comfortable grip.

Claims 1-4 include numerous functional limitations concerning how the intended usage of the device. Apparatus claims must be structurally distinguishable from the prior art. MPEP § 2114. The combined references teach an apparatus that can perform in the manner claimed by the instant invention (see Kay, fig. 1, above).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Bogart whose telephone number is (571) 272-4933.

In the event the examiner is not available, the Examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva may be reached at phone number (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for formal communications. For informal communications, the direct fax to the Examiner is (571) 273-4933.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Michael Bogart
27 May 2006


NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700